DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 196 SP 018 966

AUTHOR Bartlett, Joan; Byrd, Roland
TITLE Team Teaching Verbal, Mathematics, and Learning Skills. Howard University. The Center for Academic Reinforcement.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Classroom Environment; College Freshmen; Higher Education; *Remedial Instruction; *Student Improvement; Teacher Effectiveness; *Team Teaching; *Underachievement

ABSTRACT

Team teaching was used in three undergraduate courses to explore its potential for enhancing students' academic development. The courses were part of a program offered to freshmen with unrealized academic potential through the Howard University (District of Columbia) Center for Academic Reinforcement (CAR). A three-hour block of time was set aside for an experimental group of 14 students to take CAR courses in mathematics, verbal, and learning skills. A control group, also numbering 14, took classes in the same subjects, but not sequentially, and the classes were not team taught. Among the approaches adopted by the three teachers who acted as a team were: (1) complementing the course content as much as possible in order to reinforce skills; (2) inviting guest speakers; and (3) regularly meeting with each other to discuss pupil progress and to exchange ideas for future lessons. Questionnaires were used to gather information from teachers and students from both the experimental and control groups on the impact and effectiveness of the project. Teacher ratings of student performance, attendance, and student-teacher relationship were analyzed, as well as standardized test results. It was found that the final grades for the two groups varied only slightly, in spite of the significantly higher scores achieved by the control group in tests before the course. The three teachers who taught as a team reported a relaxed relationship in their classes, and the experimental students also remarked favorably on the experience. One of the recommendations is that team teaching be expanded and used in more courses in the following year. A bibliography of 14 references to team teaching, the questionnaires, and other CAR materials are included. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209196

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

THE CENTER FOR ACADEMIC REINFORCEMENT

TEAM TEACHING VERBAL, MATHEMATICS, AND LEARNING SKILLS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan Bartlett
Roland L. Byrd

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted by

Joan Bartlett
Reading and Study Skills Instructor

Roland Byrd
Assistant Director

SP 018 966

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Method 2

Statement of Problem 2
Procedure 3
Subjects 4
Questions Posed 5
Treatment of Data 6
Limitations 7

Results 8

Instructor and Student Feedback 10

Discussion 11

Recommendations 12

Bibliography 14

Appendixes . . . . . A-K

A. Learning Component Questionnaire
B. Mathematics Component Questionnaire
C. Verbal Component Questionnaire
D. Team Teaching Evaluation by Instructors
E. Control and Experimental Group Students' Questionnaire
F. Letter Inviting Schools and Colleges to Participate in the Project
G. Letter Inviting Potential CAR Students to Participate in the Project
H. Announcement to Students of Team Teaching Classes
I. Memo Outlining Registration Procedures
J. Letter to the Registrar Requesting the Closing of Three CAR Classes
K. Memo Requesting that Students Override to Register in the Team Teaching Classes

INTRODUCTION

> The heart of the concept of team teaching lies . . . in the essential spirit of cooperative planning, constant collaboration, close unity, unrestrained communication, and sincere sharing. It is reflected not in a group of individuals articulating together, but rather in a group which is a single, unified team. Inherent in the plan is an increased degree of flexibility for teacher responsibility, and an invigorating spirit of freedom and opportunity to revamp programs to meet educational needs of students (Dean and Witherspoon, 1962).

Team teaching (TT) is not new to the field of education; researchers and educators have documented interest in the concept since the early 1960's. Shaplin (1964), a pioneer in TT, saw great merit in teachers informally working together in planning a curriculum, arranging for visitations of each other's classes, exchanging information about students they teach in common, and trading techniques among themselves. John Maruzek (1979) viewed TT in the secondary school as a survival system for teaching slow learner classes. After fifteen years of experience in such classes, Maruzek noted several "less obvious" advantages to the approach. He saw that teachers took advantage of each other's strengths; they brainstormed together; they offered each other support; and they had someone with whom to share the job's good and bad moments. The teachers found their work more satisfying than they had before, and they tended to humanize the teaching process, becoming less authoritarian and more tolerant of human foibles. When interaction was observed by students, it helped to bridge the gap which existed between students and teachers. Maruzek also noted that slow learners raised their performance level significantly on standardized tests. Students enjoyed their student/teacher relationships, and the vast majority in the TT classes felt that the teachers respected them as

persons. Everyone in the TT classes planned to recommend them to a sibling or a friend.

Other studies conducted by Barton (1974), Bauman (1976), Kirwan (1976), Mansell (1974), McTeur (1977), Nudelman (1976), and Riley (1976) supported the findings reported by Maruzek. Through these studies the team teaching approach has become an established instructional system with definite advantages.

Realizing the benefits to learning that TT had to offer students, the Center for Academic Reinforcement (CAR) at Howard University adopted this approach as an experimental project for the Fall, 1980 academic semester. The CAR, a transitional studies program for learning, mathematics, and verbal skills for undergraduate freshmen with unrealized academic potential, seemed to be logically appropriate for such a project. The purpose of the endeavor was to offer a superior pedagogical approach which would assist students in expeditiously completing the required CAR courses.

METHOD

Statement of the Problem

Schools and colleges at Howard University utilize the CAR services primarily for freshmen who are conditionally admitted to their programs. The CAR offers courses in learning, verbal, and mathematics with the intention of tapping students' potentials by raising their academic standards and awareness. TT was introduced as a method by which students could enhance their academic development within the CAR program. Its impact on student performance and how related performance factors in concert with the TT approach contributed to this development were to be

explored through this study. The study's results would indicate the effectiveness of TT as a useful means of acquiring the basic skills needed for college freshmen.

Procedure

A committee was established to look into the employment of TT at CAR and its impact on the program. Instructors interested in the approach sought the committee out. The final core of the committee included a chairperson, a learning instructor, a mathematics instructor, and a verbal instructor. (All committee members were released from one of their regular classes in order to devote sufficient time to this project.)

The TT classes were arranged within a three-hour block of time, meeting in one of the classrooms within the Center. The TT schedule was as follows:

Course No./Section	Component	Instructor	Time	Day
099-008-10	Verbal	Mrs. S.	10:00-11:00 a.m.	MWF
099-007-07	Learning	Mrs. F.	11:10-12:00 a.m.	MWF
099-015-14	Mathematics	Mr. G.	12:10-1:00 a.m.	MWF

In order to get the students registered in the team teaching classes, the Office of the Registrar had to officially close the three CAR sections designated for this project. This closing of classes eliminated any other students from enrolling in the designated course sections. Consequently, a student who wanted to participate or who was recommended by a school or college to do so, had to come directly to the CAR to begin the enrollment process. The Center could then determine whether the student met the

qualifications. If the student did satisfy the requirements, then he/she was allowed to enter the closed classes through the "override" procedure (a procedure for registering students in closed classes at the University). After an "override" slip was processed, the student then could proceed to the Registrar's office to register for the courses.

Subjects

Fifteen students were sought to participate in this project. These students, designated the experimental group, were to meet the following criteria: (1) They had to be enrolled in all three CAR courses; (2) they had to be available to take the CAR courses during the 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. time period; (3) they were not to be participants in any other CAR project designed to facilitate students' learning potential (e.g.: the CAR's Computer Assisted Instruction Project - CAI). All schools and colleges of the University were contacted in an attempt to obtain the student subjects. Fourteen were finally enrolled in the study. Thirteen of the students were from the School of Human Ecology, and one was from the School of Engineering.

A control group of an equal number of students was necessary for the project. Students comprising it likewise had to be enrolled in all three CAR courses and excluded from other CAR special projects. A major difference between the control and experimental groups was that the control group students did not have all three of their CAR courses sequentially within one block of time.

The composition of the control group was to be matched as closely as possible with the experimental group (TT group) in terms of measurable traits—e.g. SAT scores. This was not possible due to the differences

(statistically significant) of SAT scores between the two groups (Math: $p < .01$; Verbal: $p < .001$). Likewise, large differences existed between the control and the experimental groups' scores achieved on "in-house" pre-tests given in all three components. In all instances, the control group achieved higher test scores than did the experimental group. Thus, similarities that did exist between the two groups were the following: Each group consisted of freshmen students who were conditionally admitted to the University; all students were enrolled in three CAR courses; and all students were not participants in any other special CAR project.

Questions Posed

In order to measure the impact and/or effectiveness of the TT method on the learning performance of the CAR students, certain relevant questions were posed in search of responses.

1. In light of the fact that the experimental group had significantly lower SAT scores and had scored lower on the CAR component pre-tests, what differences between the two groups, if any, would there be in grades earned in CAR courses at the end of the semester?

2. Would there be differences between pre- and post-test scores within groups as well as between groups?

3. What effect would the TT approach have on students' attendance? . . . on student performance? . . . on student/instructor relationships? . . . on the classroom situation?

4. What would be the instructors' reactions to the study?

5. What would be the level of contact between the TT instructors? How would this compare with the amount of contact between other instructors from various components who teach the same students?

The responses to these questions should generate relevant data about the feasibility of TT in the CAR program.

Treatment of Data

The team teaching approach of the experimental group differed from that of the traditional approach used by the Control group. The content of one TT course complemented the content taught in the other TT courses. For example, a study skills lesson on notetaking was taught in reference to mathematics and verbal materials. Understanding mathematical word problems was discussed in a learning class while emphasizing the core parts of the sentences involved (a verbal skill). The verbal instructor prepared a lesson on spelling emphasizing the spelling lists of the learning course. Also, guest speakers were invited in for discussion of particular topics which were of importance to the class. TT instructors met regularly with each other to discuss the progress of their students and to exchange ideas about future lessons.

The control group students went through the CAR courses as regularly designed with no special treatment being administered. Grades used for both groups were the same--S (Satisfactory), U (Unsatisfactory), and I/U (Incomplete/Unsatisfactory).

Toward the end of the semester, questionnaires (see Appendices A through C) were distributed to the TT instructors as well as the instructors comprising the control group. The questionnaires were used to get the information needed to measure the impact and effectiveness of the project. The final grades and the pre- and post-test scores of students in both groups were requested. The tests included the Nelson-Denny Reading Test, the Morrison-McCall Spelling Test, and the Study Skills Test (all Learning Component tests); The Verbal Composition, The

Descriptive Test of Language Skills of the College Board: Usage, and The Descriptive Test of Language Skills of the College Board: Sentence Structure (all Verbal Component tests); and The Cooperative Mathematics Test (the Mathematics Component test).

The Mathematics Component requires its students to complete five topics as a prerequisite to passing its course and for taking the mathematics post-test. Therefore, the number of topics completed was requested. Also, all of the instructors were asked to indicate the other instructors with whom they communicated during the semester concerning the progress of each student. This was of great concern with respect to the control group instructors. Inquiries were made also regarding student attendance, student performance, and student/teacher relationships. Additionally, the TT instructors were asked in a separate questionnaire (see Appendix D) to critically review the project, while the students in both groups were asked for their reactions to the CAR program in general (see Appendix E).

Limitations

In order to be selected as subjects in this project, students had to be conditionally admitted to the University, they had to be enrolled in all three CAR courses, and they could not be participants in CAR's CAI experiment. Only a small number of subjects met these conditions, the majority of which came from one school and were enrolled in the TT Experimental group. The size of the group as well as the students' coming primarily from one school placed limitations on the study. Consequently, these limitations reduced the study's generalization capabilities.

RESULTS

Despite the wide discrepancy in SAT and pre-test scores between the Experimental group and the Control group, the final grades for the two groups varied only slightly (see Table 1). The experimental group students achieved more S grades but fewer U and I/U grades than did the Control group students.

Table 1

Student Grades Earned in three Components

Grades	Learning		Verbal		Mathematics		E		C	
	E	C	E	C	E	C	#	%	#	%
Satisfactory (S)	7	5	5	6	5	3	17	40.5	14	33.3
Unsatisfactory (U)	4	3	9	5	4	10	17	40.5	18	42.9
Incomplete/Unsatisfactory (I/U)	3	6	0	3	5	1	18	19.0	10	23.8
TOTAL	14	14	14	14	14	14	42	100.0	42	100.0

E = Experimental Group
C = Control Group

Teacher ratings of student attendance, performance, and student/teacher relationships were analyzed, and comparisons were made between the control group and the Experimental group. The ratings included excellent, good, average, fair, and poor, with excellent and good constituting above average, and fair and poor constituting below average. In all of the rating areas, the experimental group students received higher ratings (above average) than did their counterparts in the control group. Conversely, control group students were rated below average more often in every area (see Table 2).

Table 2

Teacher Ratings of Control and Experimental Group Students on Attendance, Student Performance, and Student/ Instructor Relationships

(Percentages)

	Above Average				Average		Below Average			
	Excellent		Good				Fair		Poor	
	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C
Attendance	57.0	9.5	26.2	19.0	9.5	9.5	2.4	19.0	4.9	43.0
Student Performance	38.1	5.2	23.8	34.2	21.4	13.2	16.7	23.7	0.0	23.7
Student/Instructor Relationship	71.0	16.0	24.0	43.0	5.0	22.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	8.0

E = Experimental Group
C = Control Group

The number of pre- and post-tests taken and not taken for the Verbal and learning courses was also noted. These tests were those required by the Verbal and Learning components. The differences between the two groups being available to take the required exams was attributed to the attendance rate of the respective groups. Table 3 shows the number and the percentage of each test taken by each group.

In Mathematics, groups were compared in relation to the number of topics completed (five necessary to pass). The experimental group students completed 93 percent of the total topics for the group, while the control group students completed 41 percent of all topics for the group.

The largest difference between the two groups was the degree to which the instructors interacted and discussed their students' progress. Experimental group instructors responded that they communicated with their colleagues for just about all of their students, whereas, in the control group,

instructors communicated with colleagues who had the same students on the average of about one-tenth of the students.

Table 3

Required Tests Taken by Group

Tests	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	No. of Tests Taken	Maximum No. of Tests	Tests Taken as % of Maximum	No. of Tests Taken	Maximum no. of Tests	Tests Taken as % of Maximum
Learning:						
Nelson-Denny	13	14	93%	12	14	86%
Morrison McCall Spelling	13	14	93%	6	14	43%
Study Skills	12	14	86%	5	14	36%
Subtotals	38	42	90%	23	42	55%
Verbal:						
Composition	13	14	93%	10	14	71%
Usage	13	14	93%	10	14	71%
Sentence Structure	13	14	93%	10	14	71%
Subtotals	39	42	93%	30	42	71%
TOTALS	77	84	91.5%	53	84	63%

INSTRUCTOR AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

The team teachers reported that students developed close, relaxed relationships in their classes, and that they wished to be grouped similarly next semester. TT instructors also reported that although the students were academically weaker than those in other CAR classes, they

showed a greater desire to learn and were more attentive. The instructors noted their own enjoyment in working with and becoming familiar with the subject matter of other CAR components. They were pleased with the cooperation that each instructor afforded the other. They recommended that the chairperson participate in the teaching of the TT classes in order to get first-hand experience.

The control and the experimental group students were asked to complete a questionnaire about the CAR courses. All of the students who responded to the questionnaire remarked favorably; however, as usual, there were more responses from the experimental group than from the control group.

DISCUSSION

The team teaching experiment appeared to benefit the students involved. Even though SAT and component pre-test scores were far lower for the experimental group students, final grades of both the experimental group and the control group students were quite similar. The TT students seemed better able to meet the challenges of the CAR courses with the help of the cooperative, coordinated TT instructional approach. The TT experience afforded the instructors the opportunity to communicate with each other on a continual basis. Control group instructors discussed student progress with less than ten percent of their students; whereas, the TT instructors did so with all of their students. The manner in which the TT classes were organized was perhaps the vital difference leading to this result. The TT classes were scheduled back-to-back in the same classroom, and the three instructors had all the same students in their respective classes.

This class schedule probably helped attendance rates as well. If a student attended one class, his absence in another would be obvious. Poor attendance was the reason several control group students missed the post-tests. Control group instructors submitting the questionnaires asking for final post-test grades often wrote explanations to the effect that students stopped attending classes during the semester. In no instance was this the case with the experimental group.

In addition to the organizational benefits, the affective areas of students/teacher relationships and classroom performance were positive. Maruzek's insight concerning the communication gap between teachers and students decreasing in the personalized TT classroom experience was quite appropriate. The instructors seemed to enjoy the experience of working closely with each other. They could take advantage of each other's strengths. Students saw them interacting and making decisions, and this perhaps, as Maruzek pointed out, made them more human and less authoritarian to the students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the TT experience again be established for the Fall 1981 semester and that it be expanded to include more course sections, more instructors, and more students. The results or findings suggest that TT may be a viable approach to assist students in the grasping of the content of the CAR Mathematics, Verbal, and Learning-Skills courses:

- TT appeared to control attendance in a very positive way.
- TT brought instructors closer together.

- TT appeared to produce a higher motivation level in students.

2. CAR may also want to know if the TT approach can be more productive between two CAR courses rather than three. Combinations can be used such as Verbal and Learning or Mathematics and Learning or Verbal and Mathematics.

3. Additionally, it would be beneficial to a future experiment if a control group were more evenly matched with the experimental group in terms of measurable traits.

4. A chairperson should be chosen from among the actual TT instructors.

TT was carried out by three veteran instructors who were interested in improving what they were already doing well. Many people inside and external to the CAR program were affected by the efforts of these instructors.

Now is the time for serious reflection of the benefits of such an approach within the organization of CAR. It is time to learn from the experience and to use the knowledge acquired to guide future endeavors of the Center.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bair, Medill and Richard G. Woodward. Team Teaching in Action. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.

Barton, James, "An Experiment in Group Teaching," New Frontiers in Education," 4:3, 54-60, July/September, 1974.

Bauman, John R. and Larry L. Carter, "Individualized, Project Learning, and Team Teaching in General Mathematics," School Science and Mathematics, 76: 1, 63-67, Jan., 1976.

Chamberlin, Leslie. Team Teaching: Organization and Administration. Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969

Dean, Stuart P. and Clinnette F. Witherspoon, "Team Teaching," Education Briefs, No. 38: 4, January 1962.

Howe, Harold, II, "The Curriculum, the Team, and the School," Journal of Secondary Education. 37: 256-7, October, 1962.

Kirwan, Donald F. and Jack Willis, "Co-teaching Experiment at the University of Rhode Island," American Journal of Physics. 44: 7, 651-654.

Mansell J., "Team Teaching in Further Education," Educational Research. 17: 1, 19-26.

Marusek, John, "Team Teaching: Survival System in Teaching Slow Learning Classes," Phi Delta Kappan, 60: 521-523, March 197 .

McTeur, J. Hugh and John C. Jackson, "The Effects of Team Teaching Upon Achievement in and Attitude toward United States History," High School Journal. 61: 1, 1-6, Oct. 1977.

Nudelman, Jerold and Alvin H. Schlosser, "A Team Teaching Strategy for Composition," Teaching English in the Two-Year College. 2: 3, 167-72, Spring, 1976.

Riley, Judith, "Course Teams at the Open University," Studies in Higher Education. 1: 1, 57-61, 1976.

Shaplin, Judson T. and Henry Olds, Jr., Eds. Team Teaching. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1964.

Woodring, Paul and John Scanlon, Eds. American Education Today. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.

Appendix A

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20059

THE CENTER FOR ACADEMIC REINFORCEMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: _____
Learning Component Member

FROM: _____, Chairperson
Team Teaching Committee

RE: _____

DATE: November 25, 1980

As you know, the CAR is experimenting with a number of projects, one of which is Team Teaching. Because of the nature of this project, it is necessary to document the results. It would be greatly appreciated if you respond to the items below by December 10, 1980.

Please note that if the student mentioned above has not been given the pretests or if the student is someone for whom the questions cannot be answered, it is very important that you notify me immediately.

1. Final grade (S/U/IU/W/NR). _____
2. Score on the Nelson-Denny (N-D) Reading pretest: Vocabulary. _____
3. Score on the N-D Reading posttest: Vocabulary. _____
4. Score on the N-D Reading pretest: Comprehension. _____
5. Score on the N.D. Reading posttest: Comprehension. _____
6. Score on the N-D Reading pretest: Total. _____
7. Score on the N-D Reading posttest: Total. _____
8. Score on the Morrison McCall Spelling pretest. _____
9. Score on the Morrison McCall Spelling posttest. _____
10. Total score on the Study Skills pretest. _____

11. Total score on the Study Skills posttest. _____

12. Have you ever discussed the student's progress with other CAR faculty members? _____

    Title of the person: _____

13. Have you ever discussed the student's progress with personnel outside of CAR? _____

    Title of the person: _____

14. How would you rate this student's attendance? (Circle one.)

    Excellent Good Average Fair Poor

15. Rate how the sutdent operates in the existing classroom situation.

    Excellent Good Average Fair Poor

16. How would you rate your teacher/pupil relationship with this student?

    Excellent Good Average Fair Poor

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20059

THE CENTER FOR ACADEMIC REINFORCEMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: _____
Math Component Member

FROM: _____, Chairperson
Team Teaching Committee

RE: _____

DATE: November 25, 1980

As you know, the CAR is experimenting with a number of projects, one of which is Team Teaching. Because of the nature of this project, it is necessary to document the results. It would be greatly appreciated if you respond to the items below by December 12, 1980.

Please note that if the student mentioned above has not been given the pretests or if the student is someone for whom the questions cannot be answered, it is very important that you notify me immediately.

1. Final grade (S/U/IU/W/NR). _____

2. Score on mathematics pretest. _____

3. Score on mathematics posttest. _____

4. How many topics has this student completed? _____

5. Have you ever talked to any other CAR faculty members concerning this student? _____

   Title of person: _____

6. Have you ever discussed the student's progress with personnel outside of the CAR? _____

   Title of the person: _____

7. How would you rate this student's attendance. (Circle one.) _____

   Excellent Good Average Fair Poor

8. Rate how the student operates in the existing classroom situation.

   Excellent Good Average Fair Poor

9. How would you rate your teacher/pupil relationship with this student?

Excellent Good Average Fair Poor

Appendix C

HOWARD UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20059

THE CENTER FOR ACADEMIC REINFORCEMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: _____
Verbal Component Member

FROM: _____, Chairperson
Team Teaching Committee

RE: _____

DATE: November 25, 1980

As you know, the CAR is experimenting with a number of projects, one of which is Team Teaching. Because of the nature of this project, it is necessary to document the results. It would be greatly appreciated if you respond to the items below by December 17, 1980.

Please note that if the student mentioned above has not been given the pretests or if the student is someone for whom the questions cannot be answered, it is very important that you notify me immediately.

1. Final grade (S/U/IU/W/NR). _____

2. Score on the Verbal Diagnostic Composition (pretest). _____

3. Score on the Achievement Verbal Composition (posttest). _____

4. Score on the Descriptive Test of Language Skills of the College Board: Usage (pretest). _____

5. Score on the Descriptive Test of Language Skills of the College Board: Usage (posttest). _____

6. Score on the Descriptive Test of Language Skills of the College Board: Sentence Structure (pretest). _____

7. Score on the Descriptive Test of Language Skills of the College Board: Sentence Structure (posttest). _____

8. Have you ever talked to any other CAR faculty members concerning this student? _____

   Title of the person: _____

9. Have you ever discussed the student's progress with personnel outside of the CAR? _____

   Title of the person:_____

10. How would you rate this student's attendance? (Circle one.)

    Excellent Good Average Fair Poor

11. Rate how the student operates in the existing classroom situation.

    Excellent Good Average Fair Poor

12. How would you rate your teacher/pupil relationship with this student?

    Excellent Good Average Fair Poor

Fall 1980

Date:_____

HOWARD UNIVERSITY
THE CENTER FOR ACADEMIC REINFORCEMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20059

Teacher's Name:
_____

Team Teaching: Mid Semester Evaluation

Directions: Read through all questions before answering any of them because content often overlaps. Please supply as much information as you can since your opinions are vital in documenting the non-quantitative elements of this project. Please return this form to my mailbox by Friday, October 31st.

1. What do you feel are the advantages of the Team Teaching situation? _____

2. How have the students benefited from the experience? _____

3. How have you benefited? _____

4. What are the differences in your Team Teaching class and your regular CAR classes?

5. To what do you attribute these differences? _____

6. Are the T-T students working at the same pace as other CAR students? ____ In your opinion, why or why not? _____

7. What types of activities have you conducted in the T-T classes which are different from those conducted in your regular CAR classes? (A 2-or-3 word explanation will do.)

8. How many of your T-T students are receiving tutoring? _____

   How many tutoring arrangements have you made? _____

   How many have been arranged in coordination with the School of Education? _____

   Which do you find more advantageous? _____

   Why? _____

9. Have any other teachers in CAR or at the University come into your class as guest lecturers? _____ Who? _____ What was the topic for the day?

   How would you evaluate the experience? _____

10. Other comments: _____

JB:jd

Appendix E

Name of Student: _____

Questionnaire

Directions: Please take a few minutes to fill out the following questionnaire and return it to your teacher immediately upon completion. Your honest opinions are very important to future educational endeavors for the CAR program.

1. Do you feel that material from one CAR class is carried over into another? Explain _____

2. Do you feel you have gotten to know all three of your CAR instructors? Why or why not. _____

3. State your general impressions of the CAR program. _____

4. What are some positive aspects of the program? _____

5. What are some negative aspects of the program? _____

Appendix F

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20059

THE CENTER FOR ACADEMIC REINFORCEMENT

March 3, 1980

Dear_____:

The Center for Academic Reinforcement is currently using informal team teaching techniques for special FTIC classes. During the Fall Semester 1980, we hope to intensify the learning experience through a special team of three instructors who will teach the same fifteen students. The advantages of such a project are obvious. Each teacher will be reinforcing continuously the material of the other CAR classes. The team will meet regularly to monitor the progress of their students-in-common to modify its strategies and to stimulate achievement. The goal of the project is to be optimally supportive and, thus, enable the student to complete successfully all the CAR courses in a single semester.

The students will be identified before registration. We will need your cooperation in the scheduling of the identified students for the time blocks specified below. Each student should be able to accommodate the entire block, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., in order to participate. Only fifteen students will be allowed in these particular classes.

Verbal	099-008-10	Mrs. S	10:10-11:00	MWF
Reading/Study Skills	099-007-08	Mrs. F	11:10-12:00	MWF
Mathematics	099-015-14	Mr. G	12:10- 1:00	MWF

We would appreciate your returning the form below to _____, Chairperson, Team-Teaching Committee, Box 663, Howard University, Washington, D. C. 20059, if you are interested in having any of your students participate in this program.

Sincerely,

_____

Director, CAR

I am interested in having my school's/college's CAR students participate in the team-teaching experience. ____Yes. ____No.

Name:_____Campus Telephone:_____

School/College:_____

Appendix G

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20059

The Center for Academic Reinforcement

June 17, 1980

Dear CAR Student:

You are cordially invited to participate in a team teaching experience at the Center for Academic Reinforcement (CAR). Team Teaching is an instructional arrangement in which two or more teachers collaborate on the same group of students.

This approach has been introduced to the CAR program as a special service for students who are enrolled in all three courses: Mathematics, Verbal and Learning. Arrangements have been made so that participants will be given the optimum academic support by a special team of three instructors. The ultimate goal of the project is to allow the student to finish the courses in one semester's time.

If you are interested in taking advantage of these team taught classes, mention the following time block of courses to your advisor when you register:

Verbal	099-008-10	Mrs. S	10:10-11:00 a.m. MWF
Learning	099-007-07	Mrs. F	11:10-12:00 p.m. MWF
Mathematics	099-015-14	Mr. G	12:10-1:00 p.m. MWF

Remember: You must be advised to take all three CAR classes in order to participate in this experience and your schedule must be arranged so that you will be available from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.

Welcome!

Sincerely

_____

Chairman
Team Teaching Project

AN EXCEPTIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Students advised to take all three (3) Center for Academic Reinforcement (CAR) courses - Verbal, Mathematics, and Learning - are invited to enroll in Team Teaching classes. These classes are designed to help students complete the required CAR courses in one semester's time.

IMPORTANT

Special procedures must be followed to enroll. Come to Academic Support Building - B to find out how to do so. Ask for any of the following faculty members:

- Mrs. B - Room 103
- Mrs. F - Room 101
- Mr. G - Room 211
- Mrs. S - Room 101

Appendix I

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20059

The Center for Academic Reinforcement

MEMORANDUM

August 12, 1980

TO : Advisors Interested in the CAR Team Teaching Experience for FTIC's

FROM: _____ Director, CAR

RE : Registration Procedures for Team Teaching Classes

The team teaching project spoken of earlier this summer is about to begin. Students advised to take all three (3) Center for Academic Reinforcement (CAR) courses--Verbal, Mathematics and Learning/Study Skills--are eligible to participate in team teaching. Their schedules must be arranged to accommodate all three of the following CAR classes:

Verbal	099 008 01	Mrs. S	10:10-11:00 a.m. MWF	ASB-B 100
Learning/Study Skills	099 007 07	Mrs. F	11:10-12:00 p.m. MWF	ASB-B 105
Mathematics	099 015 14	Mr. G	12:00- 1:00 p.m. MWF	ASB-B 105

We are asking you to be sure that the students' schedules are free between the hours of 10:10 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays.

It is important that these particular students come to ASB-B in order to facilitate their registration into these classes. The classes appear closed on SOLAR so as to prevent the general FTIC population from enrolling in them. Therefore, the Center has developed a simple override procedure and will provide the students with the necessary materials to do so.

Close communication between your school and the CAR is essential since the success of this project depends on class size and other variables. Unfortunately, we have to limit the number of interested participants to fifteen (15) in order to insure conducive learning/teaching conditions.

Please contact _____ at 7634/35 or 7786 if you have any questions.

Enclosures

:jd

Appendix J

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20059

The Center for Academic Reinforcement

February 22, 1980

_____

Office of the Registrar
Howard University
Washington, DC 20059

Dear Mr. _____:

The Center for Academic Reinforcement plans to launch a team teaching program during the Fall, 1980 semester. We will identify twenty students with hopes of enrolling them in three special classes listed below and designated for the experience. Upon _____'s recommendation to _____ the chairperson of the team teaching committee, I am formally requesting that the following three Center for Academic Reinforcement classes be closed to the general student population for the Fall, 1980 semester:

099-008-10	Mrs. S	10:10 - 11:00
099-007-07	Mrs. F	11:10 - 12:00
099-015-14	Mr. G	12:10 - 1:00

We feel that there are innumerable advantages in having selected teachers work closely with a specific group of students. Thank-you for your interest and cooperation in this matter; and be assured that we will follow any further procedures you recommend to implement this project.

Sincerely,

_____

Director

cc: _____
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Appendix K

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20059

The Center for Academic Reinforcement

MEMORANDUM

TO : _____ Registrar

FROM: _____ Director, CAR

RE : Request for Override

Student's Name: _____

I.D.: _____

Date: _____

The above-named student has the permission of the Director of The Center for Academic Reinforcement to enroll in the following CAR courses for the Fall Semester of 1980-1981.

Course Number:	Instructor:
099 008 10	Mrs. S
099 007 07	Mrs. F
099 015 14	Mr. G

JB:jd